

United States Patent and Trademark Office

X'

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/993,300	11/23/2001	George Jackowski	2132.107	2132.107 5368	
21917	7590 10/19/2005		EXAMINER		
MCHALE & SLAVIN, P.A. 2855 PGA BLVD			COOK, LISA V		
	H GARDENS, FL 33410		ART UNIT PAPER NUM		
	•		1641		

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/993,300	JACKOWSKI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Lisa V. Cook	1641	

201010 till 1 mily 01 all 1 lpp 0al 21101	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Lisa V. Cook	1641				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE TH	IS APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comprodictioning time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the second continued in the seco	In the same day as filing a Notice of pwing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The replies the final rejection.	f Appeal. To avoid ab ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ly must be filed within	ence, which CFR 41.31; or n one of the			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened st above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	nliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	a filed within two mon	the of the date			
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
AMENDMENTS						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		because			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.	•			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	l16 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	·	-	_			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1</u> .	⊠ will not be entered, or b) □ wovided below or appended.	rill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>39-46</u> .						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.			
11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).						
13. Other:	1	anhl				
Olim I Cod	LONG	onhle V. LE				
Ofisa. of Cod	Supervisory pat		2/26			
		//	/ ~ a			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05) Aire XCook 10/15/05.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment filed After Final changes the scope of the claims. The biopolymer markers were previously drawn to sequences comprising the recited peptides. The amendment filed 9/16/05 requires the claims to read on sequences "consisting of" the recited sequences. This change raises new issues for consideration and search. Specifically the claims must be considered for utility (101) and enablement (112, 1st). Accordingly the amendment will not be entered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants contend that the prior art cited under 35 USC 102 does not anticipate the instant invention because they teach sequences "comprising" SEQ ID NO:1 or SEQ ID NO:2. This arguement was carefully considered but not found persuasive because the amendment to change the scope of the claims after final (filed 9/16/05) has not been entered. Accordingly the claims read on sequences comprising SEQ ID NO:1 or SEQ ID NO:2 and the cited art reads on this scope. The art rejections are maintained.